



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,174	07/15/2003	William Mak	5486-0108PUS1	4990
67321	7590	09/19/2007		
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP 8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD SUITE 100 EAST FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,174

Applicant(s)

MAK ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea N. Long

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

FINAL ACTION

Applicant's Remarks

1. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 17, 32, 44, 45, 57, 70, and 71 are amended. Claims 1-76 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14, 31, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The current claims are directed to "a computer readable medium or media including computer executable instructions". According to the specification, page 8 paragraph 31, recites, "communication media typically embodies a modulated data signal, such as a carrier wave". Signals, as a medium is not one of statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 5-9, 12-14, 32-34, 43, 44, 57-59, 66, 67, 69-70, 72, 75 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Workspace Tiling Control, November 1, 1995), hereinafter, "IBM TDB".**

As to independent claim 1, IBM TDB teaches a method for providing a user interface (page 1 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple desktop (UI) on one workstation), comprising:

providing a first viewable region capable of displaying a first portion of a desktop on a display device; and providing a second viewable region capable of displaying a second portion of the desktop on the display device (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses allowing a user to view a local desktop and a portion of a remote desktop simultaneously),

wherein a portion of the first viewable region redirects data input to and associates the data input with the second portion of the desktop (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses moving files from one workstation to another by dragging and dropping files);

accepting user input including at least a partial copy of the first viewable region; and providing a jump pane in the first viewable region, where the user input to the first viewable

region is associated to both data and control for the second viewable region (page 1 and 2 → IBM TDB teaches a user selecting a file to copy from one workspace to another workspace).

As to dependent claim 5, IBM TDB teaches wherein the first viewable region includes a data input region in which a user can enter data, wherein the data input region is outside of the portion in which the data input is redirected to the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses using a pointer to select an object which is located in one window and then dragging it to another window).

As to dependent claim 6, IBM TDB teaches moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the portion that redirects the data input to the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses moving files from one workspace to another by dragging and dropping).

As to dependent claim 7, IBM TDB teaches wherein a user input device moves the data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop. It is inherent and well known in the art that the method of dragging and dropping objects within a computer are executed through an input device, such as a mouse.

As to dependent claim 8, IBM TDM teaches method according to claim 6, further comprising: moving data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the

desktop via the portion that redirects the data input to the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses moving files from one workspace to another by dragging and dropping).

As to dependent claim 9, IBM TDB teaches moving data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the desktop via the portion that redirects the data input to the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses moving files from one workspace to another by dragging and dropping, further teaching that this operation can be performed in any window).

As to dependent claim 12, IBM TDB teaches displaying at least some content in the second viewable region when a pointing device points within the second viewable region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple workstations). Regardless of the position of the pointing device content of any of the regions can be viewed.

As to dependent claim 13, IBM TDB teaches wherein the content displayed includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the second viewable region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple workstations). Regardless of the position of the pointing device content of any of the regions can be viewed.

Dependent claim 14 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As to independent claim 32, IBM TDB teaches maintaining a first portion of a desktop; maintaining a second portion of the desktop, wherein the second portion of the desktop includes a region representing the first portion of the desktop; and altering content of the first or second portions of the desktop in at least some instances based on data input directed to the region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses multiple desktops on a screen which allow for drag and drop operation for transferring files); accepting user input including at least a partial copy of the first viewable region; and providing a jump pane in the first viewable region, where the user input to the first viewable region is associated to both data and control for the second viewable region (page 1 and 2 → IBM TDB teaches a user selecting a file to copy from one workspace to another workspace).

As to dependent claim 33, IBM TDB teaches wherein at least some data input directed to the second portion of the desktop outside the region does not affect the content of the first portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses wherein moving files by dragging and dropping initiate network transfers between the workstations, but does not change the user interface of the first display).

As to dependent claim 34, IBM TDB teaches accepting user input as the data input directed to the region (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses wherein moving files by dragging and dropping initiate network transfers between the workstations).

As to dependent claim 43, IBM TDB teaches displaying at least a portion of the first portion of the desktop in the second portion of the desktop when a pointing device points within the region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple workstations). Regardless of the position of the pointing device content of any of the regions can be viewed.

Dependent claim 44 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 32.

Independent claim 57 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 32.

Dependent claim 58 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 33.

Dependent claim 59 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 34.

Dependent claim 66 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 43.

As to dependent claim 67, IBM TDB teaches a first display device for displaying the first portion of the desktop (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB teaches displaying multiple desktops on a screen).

As to dependent claim 69, IBM TDB teaches a display device for displaying the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple desktops on a screen).

As to independent claim 70, IBM TDB teaches a user interface displayed by a display device, comprising: a first region representing a first portion of a desktop, where the first region includes a data input region where the user input also includes at least a partial copy of the first

region representing a first portion of a desktop; a second region representing a second portion of the desktop; and a data transfer path that allows data to be transferred between the first region and the second region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple desktops on a computer screen and allowing data transfer through a drag and drop operation which initiates the a network transfer between the desktops); and providing a jump pane in the first region, representing a first portion of a desktop, where the user input to the first portion of a desktop is associated to both data and control for the second viewable region (page 1 and 2 → IBM TDB teaches a user selecting a file to copy from one workspace to another workspace).

As to dependent claim 72, IBM TDB teaches wherein data directed to the data input region does not affect content of the second region (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses that the drag and drop operation allows for manipulation of the user interface. When the user is not performing that operation input in the active region will not affect the inactive region).

As to dependent claim 75, IBM TDB teaches wherein when a pointing device points within at least one of the first region or the second region, at least a portion of the first region or the second region is displayed (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses displaying multiple workstations). Regardless of the position of the pointing device content of any of the regions can be viewed.

As to dependent claim 76, IBM TDB teaches wherein the portion displayed includes information associated with a location of the pointing device (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB

Art Unit: 2176

discloses displaying multiple workstations). Regardless of the position of the pointing device content of any of the regions can be viewed.

5. Claims 15-26, 29-31, 45-54, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sigona et al (US Patent 5694150), hereinafter, "Sigona".

As to independent claim 15, Sigona teaches displaying a first portion of a desktop using a first display device; displaying a second portion of the desktop using a second display device, (Figure 3) wherein at least a portion of a display by the second display device includes a region representing the first display device (column 8 lines 1-9); and altering content displayed by the first display device in at least some instances based on data input directed to the region representing the first display device (column 9 lines 49-54); accepting user input including at least a partial copy of the first viewable region; and providing a jump pane in the first viewable region, where the user input to the first viewable region is associated to both data and control for the second viewable region (column 9 lines 49-54).

As to dependent claim 16, Sigona teaches wherein at least some data input directed outside the region representing the first display device does not affect the content displayed by the first display device (Figure 8).

As to dependent claim 17, Sigona teaches accepting user input as the data input directed to the region representing the first display device by an absolute pointing device (column 1 line 34-37, column 2 line 67- column 3 line 5).

As to dependent claim 18, Sigona teaches wherein the user input includes use of a pen (column 1 lines 34-37).

As to dependent claim 19, Sigona teaches determining at least a first coordinate of the second display device associated with the data input directed to the region representing the first display device; and remapping the first coordinate to a corresponding coordinate of the first display device (column 4 lines 58-68, column 9 line 55 through column 10 line 4).

As to dependent claim 20, Sigona teaches wherein the content displayed by the first display device is altered at the corresponding coordinate based on the data input directed to the region representing the first display device (column 7 lines 48-51, column 8 lines 1-9).

As to dependent claim 21, Sigona teaches wherein the second portion of the desktop includes a data input region in which a user can enter data, wherein the data input region is outside of the region representing the first display device (column 3 lines 25-39).

As to dependent claim 22, Sigona teaches wherein data directed to the data input region of the second portion of the desktop does not affect content displayed by the first display device (column 3 lines 25-39).

As to dependent claim 23, Sigona teaches moving data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the desktop via the region representing the first display device (column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

As to dependent claim 24, Sigona teaches wherein a user input device moves the data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the desktop (column 1 lines 34-37, column 2 line 64-67).

As to dependent claim 25, Sigona teaches moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the region representing the first display device (Figure 3, column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

As to dependent claim 26, Sigona teaches moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the region representing the first display device (Figure 3, column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

As to dependent claim 29, Sigona teaches displaying at least a portion of content in the region representing the first display device when a pointing device points within the region

representing the first display device (Figure 3, Figure 8 → Sigona discloses that regardless of the position of the pointer the region of 1st display device will be displayed).

As to dependent claim 30, Sigona teaches wherein the portion displayed includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the region (Figure 3, Figure 8 → Sigona discloses that regardless of the position of the pointer the region of 1st display device will be displayed).

Dependent claim 31 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Independent claim 45 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Dependent claim 46 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16.

Dependent claim 47 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17.

Dependent claim 48 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 19.

Dependent claim 49 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20.

Dependent claim 50 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 21.

Dependent claim 51 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 22.

Dependent claim 52 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 23.

Dependent claim 53 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 24.

Dependent claim 54 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 26.

Dependent claim 56 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 29.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 2, 3, 4, 35-41, 60-64, 68, and 71 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Workspace Tiling Control, November 1, 1995) in view of Sigona et al (US Patent 5694150).**

As to dependent claims 2 and 3, IBM TDB teaches accepting user input, wherein at least some of the user input includes the data input redirected to the second portion of the desktop (page 2 → IBM TDB discloses wherein moving files by dragging and dropping initiate network transfers between the workstations). However IBM does not teach wherein the data is redirected by an absolute pointing device such as a, pen. Sigona teaches a pen as a known pointing/input device (column 1 line 34-37).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a pen as a user input device to allow ease of dragging and dropping files on a screen and for providing a pointing coordinate).

As for dependent claim 4, IBM TDB teaches the method of claim 1. However IBM TDB does not teach determining and mapping coordinates. Sigona teaches determining at least a first coordinate of the first viewable region associated with the data input to be redirected to

Art Unit: 2176

the second portion of the desktop; and remapping the first coordinate to a corresponding coordinate of the second portion of the desktop (column 4 lines 58-68, column 9 line 55 through column 10 line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to had combined determining and mapping of coordinates of Sigona to the multiple viewing of workstations of IBM TDB to correlate a relation between multiple workstations when transferring information.

As to dependent claim 35, IBM TDB teaches the method of 34. However, IBM TDB does not teach wherein the user input includes use of a pen. Sigona teaches a pen as a known pointing/input device (column 1 line 34-37).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a pen as a user input device to allow ease of dragging and dropping files on a screen and for providing a pointing coordinate).

As to dependent claim 36, IBM TDB teaches the method of 32. However, IBM TDB does not teach determining and mapping coordinates. Sigona teaches determining at least a first coordinate of the second portion of the desktop associated with the data input directed to the region; and remapping the first coordinate to a corresponding coordinate in the first portion of the desktop (column 4 lines 58-68, column 9 line 55 through column 10 line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to had combined determining and mapping of coordinates of Sigona to the multiple viewing of

workstations of IBM TDB to correlate a relation between multiple workstations when transferring information.

As to dependent claim 37, Sigona teaches wherein the content of the first portion of the desktop is altered at the corresponding coordinate based on the data input directed to the region representing the first portion of the desktop (column 7 lines 48-51, column 8 lines 1-9).

As to dependent claim 38, IBM TDB teaches the method of claim 32. However IBM TDB does not teach wherein the second portion of the desktop includes a data input region in which a user can enter data, wherein the data input region is outside of the region. Sigona teaches wherein the second portion of the desktop includes a data input region in which a user can enter data, wherein the data input region is outside of the region (column 3 lines 25-39).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the displaying of multiple workstations of IBM TDB with desktop in which the data input region is outside of the region, to allow for flexible manipulation of the desktop.

As to dependent claim 39, IBM TDB teaches the method of claim 32. However IBM TDB does not teach moving data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the desktop via the region. Sigona teaches moving data from the second portion of the desktop to the first portion of the desktop via the region (column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the displaying of multiple workstations of IBM TDB with desktop to move data, to allow for flexible manipulation of the desktop.

As to claim dependent 40, Sigona teaches moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the region (column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

As to dependent claim 41, IBM TDB teaches the method of claim 32. IBM TDB does not teach moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the region. Sigona teaches moving data from the first portion of the desktop to the second portion of the desktop via the region (column 2 line 67 through column 3 line 5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the displaying of multiple workstations of IBM TDB with desktop to move data, to allow for flexible manipulation of the desktop.

Dependent claim 60 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 36.

Dependent claim 61 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 37.

Dependent claim 62 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 38.

Dependent claim 63 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 39.

Dependent claim 64 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 41.

As for dependent claim 68, IBM TDB teaches the system of claim 67. However, IBM TDB does not teach a second display. Sigona teaches a second display device for displaying the second portion of the desktop (Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the multiple desktop of IBM TDB with the second display device of Sigona to allow multiple viewing ports on a single GUI operating system workspace.

As to dependent claim 71, IBM TDB teaches wherein the first region includes a data input region in which a user can enter data (page 1 & 2 → IBM TDB discloses a drag and drop operation). However, IBM does not teach wherein, the data is redirected by an absolute pointing device. Sigona teaches a pen as a known pointing/input device (column 1 line 34-37).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a pen as a user input device to allow ease of dragging and dropping files on a screen and for providing a pointing coordinate).

8. **Claims 10, 11, 42, 65, 73, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (Workspace Tiling Control, November 1, 1995) in view of Herndon et al (US Patent 6249290 B1), hereinafter, "Herndon".**

As to dependent claim 10, IBM TDB teaches a method according to claim 1. However IBM TDB does not teach magnifying content. Herndon teaches further magnifying at least some content in the viewable region when a pointing device points within the viewable region (column 5 lines 1-13 → Herndon teaches zooming in on objects in response to a mouse or keyboard).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the multiple desktop of IBM TDB with the zooming engine of Herndon to allow users to review available resources from a broad perspective, and then focus with greater detail on particular resources.

As to dependent claim 11, Herndon teaches wherein the content magnified includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the second viewable region (column 2 lines 21-29).

As to dependent claim 42, IBM TDB teaches the method of claim 32. However IBM TDB does not teach magnifying portions of the desktop. Herndon teaches displaying a magnified view of at least a portion of the first portion of the desktop in the second portion of

the desktop when a pointing device points within the region (column 5 lines 1-13 → Herndon teaches zooming in on objects in response to a mouse or keyboard).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the desktop of IBM TDB with the zooming engine of Herndon to allow users to review available resources from a broad perspective, and then focus with greater detail on particular resources.

Dependent claim 65 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 42.

As to dependent claim 73, IBM TDB teaches the user interface of claim 70. However IBM TDM does not teach magnifying portions of the desktop. Herndon teaches wherein when a pointing device points within at least one of the first region or the second region, a magnified view of at least a portion of the first region or the second region is displayed (column 5 lines 1-13 → Herndon teaches zooming in on objects in response to a mouse or keyboard).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the multiple desktop of IBM TDB with the zooming engine of Herndon to allow users to review available resources from a broad perspective, and then focus with greater detail on particular resources.

As to dependent claim 74, Herndon teaches wherein the portion displayed includes information associated with a location of the pointing device (column 2 lines 21-29).

9. Claims 27-28 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sigona et al (US Patent 5694150) in view of Herndon et al (US Patent 6249290 B1).

As to dependent claim 27, Sigona teaches the method of claim 1. However, Sigona does not teach magnifying a portion of the content. Herndon teaches magnifying at least a portion of content in the region representing the first display device when a pointing device points within the region representing the first display device (column 5 lines 1-13 → Herndon teaches zooming in on objects in response to a mouse or keyboard).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the desktop of Sigona with the zooming engine of Herndon to allow users to review available resources from a broad perspective, and then focus with greater detail on particular resources.

As to dependent claim 28 Herndon teaches wherein the portion magnified includes information associated with a location of the pointing device with the region (column 2 lines 21-29).

Dependent claim 55 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 27.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 07/05/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Independent claims 1, 15, 32, 45, 57, and 70 recite similar amended claim limitations “accepting user input including at least a partial copy of the first viewable region” and “providing a jump pane in the first viewable region, where the user input to the first viewable region is associated both data and control for the second viewable region”.

Applicant asserts that neither IBM TDB or Sigona teach the recited claim limitations.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that the amended limitations in the claims merely recite steps that were previously presented in the claims, but is using different verbiage to portray the function. Both IBM TDB and Sigona teach the aforementioned claim limitations.

As for IBM TDB, it teaches a user being able to copy files or other data from one workspace/desktop to another workspace/desktop that resides on the same display. The user input is described by the function of dragging and dropping files (which is a partial copy of the first viewable region) from one region to another region. The Applicant's specification defines a jump pane as a portion of a user interface providing a portal that allows users to enter, move, or otherwise manipulate or handle data located in one portion of a desktop from a second, independent portion of the desktop. Applicant's specification also discloses wherein the entire viewable region can be considered a “jump pane”. Therefore IBM TDB teaches the limitations of accepting user input and a jump pane.

Sigona similar teaches that same functions as the of IBM TDB, but provides multiple displays that display a first and second portion of a desktop, wherein actions and events which take place in the first portion of the desktop can be redirected in the second portion of the desktop. Similarly the "jump pane" and accepting user input merely recites limitations previously presented.

Conclusion

11. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
September 14, 2007

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER